



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/793,416	10/23/1997	JOHN THOMAS HARE	18872.0056	5267

25312 7590 05/03/2005

WILSONART INTERNATIONAL, INC.
C/O WELSH & FLAXMAN, LLC
2450 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
SUITE 112
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)	Application No. 08/793,416	Applicant(s) HARE, JOHN THOMAS	
	Examiner Harvey E. Behrend	Art Unit 3641	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 2/2/05 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer. **EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☒ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☒ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed or confirmed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☒ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☐ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

Art Unit: 3641

In further regard to item 2 above, the status of claims does not refer to canceled claims 27-29.

In further regard to item 4 above, the specification on page 7 lines 2-5 does not state the slit is unsealed along its length. Hence, the "concise explanation" in the brief is incorrect.

In further regard to item 5 above, appellants issue 2 on page 3 of the brief is incorrect as it fails to include the words "any of" before the word "Lubow" in line 2 and before the term "U.S. Patent" in line 4.

In further regard to item 5 above, appellants issue 3 on page 4 of the brief is incorrect as it fails to include the words "any of" before the word "Lubow" in line 2 and before the term "U.S. Patent" in line 3.

In further regard to item 5 above, appellants issue 4 on page 4 of the brief is incorrect as it improperly combines the three, separate rejections set forth in sections 7, 8 and 9 of the 5/25/04 final rejection, into a single issue.



Behrend/vs
April 21, 2005

HARVEY E. BEHREND
PRIMARY EXAMINER